

### **REMARKS**

Claims 1-8, 10-12 and 14-39 are presented for examination. Claims 1, 23, 33, 37 and 39 are independent. Claim 1 and 23 have been amended. No new matter has been added. Claims 9 and 13 have been previously canceled without prejudice and disclaimer to the claimed subject matter. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested. In response to the finality of the Office Action, Applicant is submitting herewith a Request for Continued Examination.

Claims 1-8, 10-12, and 14-39 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. Applicant submits that the terms recited in the claims derive their meaning from the Specification. Applicant submits that the Specification provides support for the presently recited claim language, at least in paragraphs 0028-00124, and specifically in paragraphs 0016, 0038-0062 and 00126-0149. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the claim rejections is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-4, 6-8, 10-12, 14-16, 18-27 and 29-39 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,985,882 (Del Sesto) in view of U.S. Publication No. 2003/0050827 (Hennessey); Claims 5, 17 and 28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Del Sesto in view of Hennessey, and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,772,129 (Alvarez). Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are respectfully requested for at least the following reasons.

Claim 1 recites a method comprising: specifying a target Gross Rating Point (GRP) for one or more lines of an Internet advertising campaign; specifying a total booked amount for the lines; apportioning, via a computer device, the target GRP among one or more time periods of the Internet advertising campaign; apportioning, via the computer device, the total booked amount among the time periods, wherein recognized revenue being based on the apportioned target GRP and the apportioned total booked amount; and visibly displaying the recognized revenue on a user interface on a display of the computer device.

By way of non-limiting example, in an embodiment, subject matter is directed to a system for conducting an online advertising campaign. The system specifies a target Gross Rating Point (GRP) for one or more lines of an Internet advertising campaign. The system also specifies a total booked amount for the lines. The target GRP is apportioned

among one or more time periods of the Internet advertising campaign. The total booked amount is apportioned among the time periods, wherein recognized revenue is based on the apportioned target GRP and the apportioned total booked amount. The system then facilitates visible display of the recognized revenue on a user interface on a display of a computer device.

Independent claim 1 recites, in part:

specifying a target Gross Rating Point (GRP) for one or more lines of an Internet advertising campaign;  
specifying a total booked amount for the lines;

The Office Action states that Del Sesto discloses this claim element with a total budget at Fig. 4J. Applicant respectfully disagrees. Applicant respectfully submits that Del Sesto's budget is not a "total booked amount" as claimed. Applicant's "total booked amount" is the total amount of money that has been booked for one or more lines of an advertising campaign and is not an estimate of expected income and expense for a given period in the future (i.e., a budget). As a result, Del Sesto's Fig. 4J does not disclose specifying a total booked amount for the lines, as Del Sesto's budget is not a total booked amount.

Independent claim 1 also recites, in part:

apportioning, via a computer device, the target GRP among one or more time periods of the Internet advertising campaign;  
apportioning, via the computer device, the total booked amount among the time periods, wherein recognized revenue being based on the apportioned target GRP and the apportioned total booked amount.

The Office Action states that Del Sesto does not disclose the above claim elements and relies on Hennessey to cure the deficiencies of Del Sesto. Hennessey describes utilizing customer/user generated data and market available data to provide a framework and guidance for a seller to price advertising time and space for programs offered by a media outlet, and to project future demand for advertising time and space. Hennessey determines the number of available advertising spots (avails) that exist in a market, the projected rating of the avail, the historical advertising avail sales price, and a reasonable target price for each avail. Hennessey utilizes avail request information from individual advertising agency clients, sellout data from broadcast media, together with

ratings and projections from published rating services (such as Nielsen and CMR) to produce a series of reports that provide needed information to create projections of future inventory, demand and pricing ranges. The reports include avail demand and analysis reports, market blueprint reports, market CPP tolerance reports, pricing grids, and market share trend reports.

The Office Action states that Hennessey discloses the apportioning the target GRP claim element at Figure 6 because “the GRP is divided by day parts.” Applicant respectfully disagrees that Hennessey discloses the apportioning the target GRP claim element. Fig. 6 of Hennessey is an Avail Requests by Points Report in which the “daypart column displays how many points per daypart the advertiser has pending.” (Hennessey, Paragraph [0078]).

The Office Action states that Hennessey discloses apportioning the total booked amount claim element in Figure 7 because “the budget is divided by day parts.” Applicant respectfully submits that Hennessey’s budget is not a “total booked amount” as claimed. As a result, Hennessey’s Fig. 7 does not disclose apportioning a total booked amount among one or more time periods.

Independent claim 1 also recites, in part:

wherein recognized revenue is based on the apportioned target GRP and the apportioned total booked amount; and

The Office Action states that Hennessey discloses this claim element at Fig. 11. Applicant respectfully disagrees. Fig. 11 of Hennessey has a % Revenue Contribution column, but Hennessey does not disclose recognized revenue being based on an apportioned target GRP and an apportioned total booked amount, as claimed in independent claim 1.

Independent claim 1 also recites, in part:

visibly displaying the recognized revenue on a user interface on a display of the computer device.

The Office Action states that Hennessey discloses this claim element in Fig. 7. Applicant respectfully disagrees. Fig. 7 of Hennessey discloses a budget but does not disclose a recognized revenue being displayed on a user interface.

Therefore, Applicant submits that Del Sesto and Hennessey, taken alone or in combination, do not teach, disclose nor suggest all of the claimed subject matter of claim 1. Thus, because Del Sesto and Hennessey do not teach or suggest the above claim elements, it is respectfully submitted that claim 1 is patentable over Del Sesto and Hennessey, and Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection. Nor could Del Sesto and Hennessey, alone or in combination with any reference of record render Claim 1 obvious, as no such combination would yield all of the elements in the presently recited claims.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Claim 1 and the claims that depend from claim 1 are believed to be in condition for allowance. In addition, for at least the same reasons stated above with respect to claim 1, independent Claims 23, 33, 37 and 39 are also believed to be in condition for allowance, and accordingly, the claims that depend from Claims 23, 33, 37 and 39 are also believed to be in condition for allowance.


Claims 5, 17 and 28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Del Sesto in view of Hennessey, and in further view of Alvarez. It is respectfully submitted that the features described above with respect to Claims 1, 23, 33, 37 and 39, from which Claims 5, 17 and 28 depend, respectively, are applicable to these claims as well, and that Alvarez does not remedy these deficiencies. Therefore, Applicant submits that a combination of Del Sesto, Hennessey and Alvarez would not yield all of the elements in the presently cited claims, and therefore the combination cannot form the basis of a proper obviousness rejection.

Having responded to all objections and rejections set forth in the outstanding Office Action, it is submitted that the currently pending claims are in condition for allowance and Notice to that effect is respectfully solicited. Additional characteristics or arguments may exist that distinguish the claims over the prior art cited by the Examiner, and Applicant respectfully preserves their right to present these in the future, should they be necessary. In the event that the Examiner is of the opinion that a brief telephone or personal interview will facilitate allowance of one or more of the above claims, he is respectfully requested to contact Applicant's undersigned representative.

The Applicant's attorney may be reached by telephone at 212-801-6729. All correspondence should continue to be directed to the address given below, which is the address associated with Customer Number 76058.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any required fee in connection with the submission of this paper, any additional fees which may be required, now or in the future, or credit any overpayment to Account No. 50-1561. Please ensure that the Attorney Docket Number is referenced when charging any payments or credits for this case.

Respectfully submitted,



James J. DiCarlo  
Reg. No. 36,120

Date: September 16, 2009

Customer Number 76058  
GREENBERG TRAURIG, LLP  
Met Life Building  
200 Park Avenue, 34<sup>th</sup> Floor  
New York, New York 10166  
Phone: (212) 801-9200  
Fax: (212) 801-6400